## CIVIL DOCKET UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## Jury demand date:

D. C. Form No. 106A Rev.

TITLE OF CASE	ATTORNEYS
	For plaintiff:
David Ray Cornelius,	Lloyd G. Larkin 203 Pythian Building
Plaintiff,	19 West Fifth Street Tulsa, OK 74103
VS.	747-8094
The <u>City of Tulsa</u> , a municipal corporation, <u>Carroll E.</u> <u>Griffith</u> , <u>Jack Purdy</u> and <u>Dan Phillips</u> ,	
Defendants.	
7	For defendant; Waldo F. Bales & Philip S. Haney, Ass't City Attorney 200 Civic Center Tulsa, OK 74103

STATISTICAL RECORD	COSTS			DATE	name or receipt no.	REC.		DISB.	
J.S. 5 mailed 6-7-74	Clerk		711	. 1	4 C/D #46	15.	00	15	00
J.S. 6 mailed 6-1-76	Marshal								
Basis of Action: Deprivation of Constitutional Right 5th & 14th Amendments.	ts;								
Action arose at:	Depositions	REIGNAL MARKET PRESENTATION	1000						

DATE	PROCEEDINGS	Date Order or Judgment Noted
5-20-74	1. Complaint filed and summons issued. v	
5-28-74	Return on service of summons, filed. ds Served the City of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla on 5-22-74. (\$3.00) Served Dan Phillips at Tulsa, Okla On 5-21-74. (\$3.00) Served Jack Purdy at Tulsa, Okla on 5-21-74, (\$3.00) Served Carroll E. Griffith at Tulsa, Okla on 5-28-74. (\$3.00)	
6-5-74	Alias Summons issued. v	
6-10-74	Alias Summons, ret. & filed: served Dan Phillips and Jack Purdy on 6-5-74; Carroll E. Griffith on 6-6-74, and The City of Tulsa on 6-7-74. (USM \$12.00)g	
6-25-9 <sup>1</sup>	Application and order for extension of time within which to plead or answer, filed. Order signed by Clerk extending time to answer to July 10, 1974. ds	
7-9-74	Motion to Dismiss, filed by Def., City of Tulsa.k	
7-9-74	Memorandum Brief in Support of the Motion to Dismiss of the Def. City of Tulsa, filed.k	
7-31-74	MO: It is ordered by the Court that Pltf. is granted ten (10) days from this date to respond to Defts' Motion to Dismiss. (AEB-J) copies mailed.k	k
8-12-74	Pltf's brief in response to def's memorandum brief in support of the motion to dismiss of the def. City of Tulsa, filed.k	
9-24-74	7. Defts.' Motion for Summary Judgment, filed. Affidavit of Dan Phillips and Brief in Support attached to motion. v	
9-24-74	MO: Ordered by the Court that Plaintiff is granted 10 days from this date to respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. (AEB-J)v	
10-7-74	8. Pltf's Application to Enlarge Time within Which to File Respon filed.lm	se,
10-8-74		
10-24-74	10. Pltf's Response to Defts' Mtn. for S/J, filed.jj	
10-24-74	11. Pltf's Brief in Support of Pltf's Response to Defts' Mtn. for S/J, filed.jj	
10-24-74 3-19-7 4-16-7	DEPOSITIONS of Tom Yerton and Dan Phillips, taken on behalf of pltf on 10-16-74 before Evelyn E. Rutherford, LSR, (\$108), filed in 5 M0: Case referred to Mag. Bradford for hrg/rec re pending mots. (Al Case called for hearing on Deft's motion to dismiss & motion for S/J. Parties present. Deft's motion to dismiss sustained as to City of Tulsa & motion for S/J overruled. Pltf. to prepare order & Findings & recommendations in 5 days.(MLB-Mag) b	3 B-J)k

**⊕** 

D. C. 110A Rev. Civil Docket Continuation	D	C 110	A Rev	Civil	Docket	Continuatio
---	---	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------------

DATE		PROCEEDINGS	Date Order or Judgment Noted
4-24-75	12. ]	Findings & Recommendations of Magistrate on Deft's motion Addition to dismiss and motion for summary Judgment, filed.(MLB-Mag)b cps	mld
4-29-75	13.	Defts' objection to the F&R of Magistrate on Defts' Mot. to Dismiss & Mot. for S/J, filed.k	
4-29-75	MO:	It is ordered by the Court that pltf. is granted ten days from this date to respond to defts' objection to F&R of Magistrate. (AEB-J)k cps mld	
5-9-75	14.	Pltf.'s response to Deft.'s Objection to the Findings and Recommendations of the Magistrate on Defts.' Mot. to Dismiss and Mot. for Summary Judgment, file	d v
5-9-75	15.	Brief in support, filed. v	u. v
5-9-75	16.	Plaintiff's objection to the F&R of the Magistrate on Defts.' Mot. to Dismiss w/respect to the Deft., City of Tulsa, filed. v	
5-9-75 5-9-75	17. MO:	Brief in support, filed. v It is ordered by the Court that Defts. are granted 10 days from this date to respond to Pltf.'s objection to the F&R of the Magistrate on Defts.' Mot. to Dismiss w/respect to the Deft., The City of Tulsa. (AEB-J)v	
5-20-75	18.	Defts.' response to Pltf.'s objection to the F&R of the Mag. on Defts.' Mot. to Dismiss w/respect to the Deft., The city of Tulsa, filed. $$ v	
6-2-75	19.	Pltf's response to defts' response to pltf's obj. to F&R of the Mag. on defts' motion to dismiss with respect to the deft., Cit of Tulsa, filed. lm	y
5-19-76	20.	Memorandum and Order dismissing cause of action and complaint, filed $\S$ entered. It is ordered that the mot. to dismiss filed by defts. is sustained and the cause of action and complaint are dismissed. Further, that the mot. for Summary Judgment is hereby overruled as being moot, the ruling on the mot. to dismiss being dispositive of the action. (AEB-J)k cps mld	

Date Order or Judgment Note DATE PROCEEDINGS